

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 15, 18, 37, 39, and 45 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 46-49 are new. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 15, 18-20, 37, 39-41, and 45-49 are pending.

### ***Objections to the Specification***

The Examiner has objected to the Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection is improper. Claim 45 as amended recites a “computer program product” and a “non-transitory computer readable storage medium”. Paragraph [0043] of the Specification explains that the invention also comprises an application program itself as recorded in any magnetic or electronic media, and a computer system programmed with this program. Applicants therefore believe there is a proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101***

Claim 45 has been amended in a manner that is believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Specifically, as Examiner suggests on Page 3 of the 02/14/2011 Office Action, the claim as amended recites a “non-transitory computer readable storage medium”. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, and without limitation, in the above-captioned application in paragraph 0043. The rejection of claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is therefore respectfully traversed.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103***

#### **A.**

The Applicant asserts that with regards to the amended claims 1, 15, 37, and 45 and a limitation of concatenating a message sender and a message sender submission time into a string, support may be found, for example and without limitation, in Provisional Application 60/268,092, filed February 12, 2001 on Page 1, Lines 1-16.

#### **B.**

Claims 1, 15, 37, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hughes, US Patent No 6,122,372 in view of Yeager, US Patent No 6,167,402, in further view of Graham et al., US Patent Publication No. 2002/0178271 (hereinafter, “Graham”).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claims 1, 15, 37, and 45, Hughes teaches encapsulating a business transaction message with verifiable data generated identifiers. As Hughes teaches, transaction messages including letters of credit, standby letters of credit, bills of lading, certificates of insurance, bankers acceptances, invoices, sight drafts, trust receipts, represent essential business relationships for import and export. Given the high importance associated with a transaction message, Hughes describes in Figure 2 and Figure 3 deriving a verifiable data generated identifier based on a cryptographic hash of a message set including a message body 212 [Hughes, column 3 lines 23-30]. Yeager teaches an efficient message store and delivery system responsive to the Internet Message Access Protocol (IMAP) with efficient indexing [Yeager: Abstract, column 5 lines 2-13]. Graham describes dynamic file access control and management to reduce privacy threats and data piracy [Graham: Abstract, Paragraphs 0003-0009].

By contrast, claims 1, 15, 37, and 45 recite retrieving a message from a first mailbox, computing a message tag, then comparing message tags to messages from a second mailbox “wherein the second mailbox is associated with a *different electronic mail recipient* than the first mailbox” (emphasis added) as recited in claims 1, 15, 37 and 45. Deduplicating mail across different mailboxes for different users includes the improvement of further efficiencies not taught in Hughes, Yeager and Graham, separate or in combination.

### ***New Claims***

New claims 46-49 recite the limitation of applying a hash function as supported, for example, and without limitation, in the above-captioned application in paragraph 0028.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 16, 2011

/Christopher C. Tan/

Christopher C. Tan

Registration No. 61,950

V 408-207-4761

F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014